DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 350 JC 810 213

TITLE Report of the Adult Education Policy Commission to the California Legislature.
INSTITUTION California State Commission on Adult Education Policy, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 1 Apr 81
NOTE 25p.: Report of a joint legislative commission.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; *College School Cooperation; *Community Colleges; *Educational Responsibility; *Public Policy; *School Districts; *State Aid; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Findings are presented for a study commissioned by the California Legislature to prepare policy recommendations on the delineation of adult education functions between school and community college districts and to review revenue equalization for adult education. The report first describes study procedures, which involved a series of public hearings before the Adult Education Policy Commission, and then outlines six principles followed by the Commission in recommending changes in state policy. The report then provides an analysis of the issues related to current policy: (1) there are current hidden legislative incentives for individual communities to shift adult education classes from school districts to community colleges; (2) barriers to state funding parity between school and college districts are caused by the fact that community college adult education programs cannot be fiscally disaggregated from the rest of the curriculum; (3) there are legitimate arguments both for concentrating the delivery of adult education in the colleges and for school district delivery of services; and (4) a common operational definition of adult education should be proposed by the legislature. The report concludes with nine recommendations, proposing, for example, state adult education allocations per average daily attendance and that individual school districts and colleges negotiate agreements delineating adult education functions. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201350

Report
of the
Adult Education Policy Commission
to the
California Legislature

April 1, 1981

JC 810213

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gerald C. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Members of the Commission on Adult Education Policy

Senator Peter Behr
Chairman

State Board of Education Representatives:

Lorenza C. Schmidt
Director
Middle Earth

William J. Johnston
Superintendent
Los Angeles Unified School District

Robert Williams
Assistant Superintendent
Contra Costa County Schools Office

California Community Colleges Representatives:

Marilyn Lassman
President
Board of Governors

Daniel Grady
Trustee
San Diego Community College District

Thomas W. Fryer, Jr.
Chancellor
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District

Executive Director: Marcia Salner

Secretary: Katherine Waki

Inverness, CA 94937

April 15, 1981

Gerald C. Hayward
Chancellor
California Community Colleges
1238 "S" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Hayward:

Enclosed you will find the Final Report of the Adult Education Policy Commission, which was established in Supplemental Language to the Budget Act of 1980 (Item 352/4).

The commission was established to "prepare policy recommendations on delineation of functions and review revenue and expenditure equalization for adult education." Three appointees each were named by the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. These six appointees selected me to chair the commission.

Six members agreed, in principle, with the general approach to the problems of delineation of functions and equity of funding contained in the Final Report. Dr. Thomas W. Fryer, Jr. did not agree with the general approach as it pertained to equity of funding.

All members were given the opportunity to submit letters summarizing aspects of the Final Report with which they were in personal disagreement. Three such letters are attached to and made a part of the Final Report. Also attached is a letter from me that I felt was needed to clarify some important recommendations made in the Final Report.

It is hoped the Commission's deliberations may prove helpful in resolving the long-standing problems in adult education we were asked to review.

Sincerely,

s/ Peter Behr

Peter Behr
Chairman

Enclosure

cc: Gus Guichard

REPORT

OF THE

ADULT EDUCATION POLICY COMMISSION

The Adult Education Policy Commission was established by tne California Legislature "to prepare policy recommendations on delineation of functions and review revenue and expenditure equalization for adult education."

This language was based on a recommendation made by the Legislative Analyst contained in the 1980-81 Analysis of the Budget Bill (pages 1017-1018). The Analyst's recommendation was made for the following reasons:

- The pre-Proposition 13 structure for delineation of functions among providers of adult education was no longer effective given the post-Proposition 13 legislation.
- Current funding for K-12 adult education covers only programs mandated by Chapter 292, Statutes of 1979 (AB 8), while community colleges may be funded for all adult programs.
- Funding for K-12 adult programs is at a lower level than funding for community college programs.

The following report describes tne Commission's procedures, its findings, and its recommendations.

Procedures of the Commission

The Commission convened in September of 1980 and met in eleven sessions between then and March 14, 1981. The six members

of the Commission--three appointed by the State Board of Education and three appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges--nominated and elected a seventh member to serve as chairperson of the Commission. An executive director and a secretary were hired to assist the Commission in the conduct of its meetings and the preparation of this report.

The Commission heard public testimony and presentations from representatives of a large number of local agencies involved in providing adult education in urban, suburban and rural areas throughout California. Six sessions in Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego and Sacramento were devoted to hearing this testimony. Representatives from the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst testified before the Commission. Commission members and staff reviewed many related agency documents and much written material some submitted at the Commission's request. All eleven hearings were open to the public and the press.

Goals of the Commission

Members of the Commission agreed that the following principles should guide the search for appropriate changes in statewide adult education policy.

1) Highest priority should be given to meeting the educational needs of California's adults.

2) It is inappropriate and wasteful to make dramatic changes that would have the effect of disrupting, weakening or closing programs of either the K-12 or community college segments which currently are serving these needs in an effective manner.

3) While all adults have a right to lifelong learning opportunities there are certain population groups in California which are demonstrably in greater immediate need for adult education than other groups. The Legislature has identified these groups in the programs currently authorized in AB 2196 (1980) for apportionment in K-12 district and county adult schools.**

4) In some geographic areas of the state these population groups so much in need of adult education are so large that the continued activity of both segments (K-12 and community colleges) will not be able to provide essential services under present funding levels.

5) Funding parity between the segments for the same services is, in principle, a worthy goal because, where funding is equal, the decision as to which segment should provide a given service is more likely to reflect educational criteria rather than fiscal pressures.

6) Locally elected officials are best qualified to determine what mix of adult education programs will best serve their jurisdictions because the educational needs of different geographical areas of California are so diverse.

Analysis of the Problem

The Comission finds that, historically and currently, adult education programs tend to gravitate toward the source of maximum revenue. The movement of adult education programs from one deliverer to another as a result of numerous changes in funding policy enacted by the State Legislature has been evident since the 1940's

**The programs are listed in Appendix A of this report.

and has been a recurrent pattern. As a result, stable delineation of functions agreements between deliverers have been difficult to maintain since changes in funding policy tend to supercede them and adult education has suffered along with the taxpayers.

During the past four years, the State Legislature has employed a number of policy devices for dealing with these general tendencies in an effort to stabilize program movement, control enrollment growth, and eliminate incentives that encourage the exploitation of adult education programs. Unfortunately, the legislative solution to one problem has frequently resulted in the creation of problems in other areas. This is the situation currently confronting the Commission.

Current legislative policy for adult education creates a fiscal incentive for a local community to shift some or all of its adult education classes away from the K-12 districts and into the community colleges. The incentive exists because the range of course offerings that can be offered to adults is unrestricted in the community colleges and the rate of revenue per unit of average daily attendance (ADA) is considerably higher on average than it is in the K-12 districts. Furthermore, K-12 adult programs are not funded by the state beyond a 2% growth rate in ADA. Community colleges, however, have more latitude although there is a negative incentive for growth in the form of incremental funding and a budget ceiling has placed an absolute limit on current growth.

The existing policy situation has created concern on the part of the Commission that the overall fiscal savings to the taxpayer that restriction on K-12 adult education programs were designed to effect may be ineffective. Although the Commission was not able to determine the exact statewide magnitude of program or enrollment shifts toward the community colleges, some individual cases are documented and losses in revenues to K-12 coupled with a recent increase of 37.9% in non-credit ADA in the community colleges** suggest that the structural incentives still exist.

Deliberations on this concern by the Commission served to clarify a difficulty faced by the community colleges as a result of legislated funding policy. Community college districts are now funded at a base revenue rate per ADA that represents, among other things, an average of the prior non-credit and credit rates. This means that non-credit classes in the community colleges are funded at a higher rate per ADA than previously--a fact frequently cited by K-12 adult educators who are critical of this further aggravation of funding inequity. However, of greater importance to the community colleges is the fact that the more costly credit classes are now being funded at a correspondingly lower rate than previously as a result of a complex averaging process. Thus, the community colleges require the difference between actual costs and current revenues in non-credit classes so as to adequately support their credit offerings.

**A Comparison of Credit and Non-Credit ADA, 1979-80 and 1980-81, prepared by the staff of the California Post-secondary Education Commission, February, 1981.

The current policy of fiscal non-discrimination between credit and non-credit classes in the community colleges means that modification of the funding pattern of adult education results in modifications in the funding pattern of the entire college system. Consequently, the Commission found that its efforts to create a mechanism for achieving parity in funding between K-12 and community college adult education programs became complicated by the fact that adult education is fiscally inseparable from the regular course offerings of the community colleges.

Many representatives of the community colleges testified to the effect that this very inseparability of adult education from the general mission of the community colleges constitutes justification for making the community colleges the sole deliverer of adult education services in the state. Although this proposal would resolve the delineation of functions issue, the Commission can find no evidence that it would be a cost effective solution and found some evidence that the proposal would result in increased burdens to the state's taxpayers.

On the other hand, the lower costs incurred by the state for classes in K-12 district adult programs generated testimony that delineation of functions disputes should be resolved in favor of the K-12 segment. The spokesman for the State Department of Finance recommended that adult education be offered by the segment which can offer the classes at least cost given a comparable level of quality. Because this does indeed seem to be so reasonable, the Commission feels compelled to warn the Legislature that this kind of simplistic fiscal solution merely

eliminates the need to look at real issues affecting education finance, i.e., demographic shifts in the age and ethnic composition and the goals of community college students and the general underfunding of adult education, historically and currently in California. Pushed to its logical extreme, the "least cost" solution finds that the cheapest education is no education at all.

The Commission finds that there is a need for a definition of adult education that will hold true for both the K-12 and community college segments. Without this common definition, it is not possible to delineate functions nor to resolve problems resulting from inequitable differences in funding patterns.

The Commission elects to support the operational definition of adult education that the State Legislature has endorsed in AB 2196 (1980).* The ten program areas which are fiscally supported by the state in K-12 district and county adult schools reflect a set of statewide priorities for providing services to the state's neediest citizens, e.g., those lacking basic reading and computational skills, immigrants, the non-English speaking, the handicapped, senior citizens, and the unemployed. The Commission recognizes that these ten program areas do not reflect the full scope of adult education guaranteed to the citizens of California under present law. However, the Commission recognizes that these ten areas reflect temporary legislative funding priorities in a period of great economic constraint.

*See Appendix A.

In creating an operational definition of adult education which can apply to the community colleges, the Commission finds that distinguishing between credit classes and non-credit classes is a complicating factor. Community college classes in these ten programmatic areas are offered either for credit or on a non-credit basis depending on many factors. However, the Commission finds evidence that new regulations proposed in the recent report from the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges regarding the distinction between credit and non-credit classes, coupled with increased sensitivity on the part of local community college governing boards about the need for clearer distinctions, may resolve this difficulty. For this reason, the Commission makes no recommendations regarding credit/non-credit distinctions in adult education programs. Instead, it simply wishes to call attention to the need for a continuation of efforts already underway.

During the course of its public hearings, the Commission received considerable testimony and documentation to prove that there are many valuable, cost-effective and community responsive programs in adult education offered by both segments throughout the state. Considering the need to improve the quality of life and develop survival skills for large segments of the state's population, it is the hope of the Commission that the policy formulated by the Legislature, utilizing recommendations from this Commission report, will place the educational needs of adult citizens in the front and center of its concerns.

Recommendations

The Adult Education Policy Commission recommends

1) that all classes, courses, and programs in subject areas currently authorized by the State Legislature for apportionment in K-12 district and county adult schools** be funded at the rate of $1300 per unit of ADA, adjusted for inflation, regardless of whether these classes, courses or programs are offered by a K-12 or community college district;

2) that a community college district currently receiving a per unit of ADA rate in excess of $1300 shall be held harmless, i.e., the difference between $1300 and the district's 1980-81 average revenue per ADA shall be multiplied by the ADA in non-credit classes in the ten authorized program areas and this difference shall be included in the district's base rate of revenue;

3) that any increase in ADA in the ten authorized program areas that is over and above the 1980-81 level in either K-12 or community college district should be funded up to a maximum of 5% per year of the prior year's apportionment adjusted for inflation;

4) that both K-12 districts and community college districts receive a common rate of increase for inflation per year;

5) that each community college district board of trustees shall negotiate a new formal delineation of functions agreement with each local board of education any part of whose geographic

**See Appendix A.

territory is included in the community college district, which agreement shall be binding on all parties for a minimum of four years;

6) that the content of these delineation of functions agreements shall specify which educational deliverers have responsibility for classes, courses or programs in the subject areas listed in the California Education Code, section 41976;

7) that these delineation of functions agreements shall be signed by the chairpersons of the local community college district board of trustees and the local board of education on or before July 1, 1984, and a copy of the agreement forwarded to the State Board of Education and the Community College Board of Governors;

8) that, in the event of non-agreement between the local community college board of trustees and the local board of education, binding arbitration at the local level shall be mandated as a procedure for creating resolution if fact-finding recommendations by the arbitrator(s) fail to result in agreement between the boards;

9) that meetings regarding delineation of functions in adult education shall be subject to the provisions of the Brown Act.

Appendix A

Adult Education Program Areas
Authorized for State Apportionment by AB 2196 (1980)

(California Education Code, section 41976)

1. Parenting, including parent co-operative preschools, classes in child growth and development and parent-child relationships, and classes in parenting;
2. Elementary and secondary basic skills and other courses and classes required for the high school diploma. (Apportionments for these courses and classes may only be generated by students who do not possess a high school diploma, except for remedial, academic courses or classes in reading, mathematics, and language arts.);
3. English as a Second Language;
4. Citizenship for immigrants;
5. Education programs for substantially handicapped;
6. Short term vocational programs with high employment potential;
7. Education programs for older adults;
8. Education programs for apprentices;
9. Education programs in home economics;
10. Health and safety education

Comments of Chairman Peter Behr on Recommendations 5 Through 9 of the Final Report

As Chairman of the Adult Education Policy Commission, I must confess that Recommendations 5 through 9 on pages 9 and 10 of the Final Report are subject to misinterpretation. Both Commission members Marilyn Lassman and Daniel B. Grady, in their letters attached to the report, construe these recommendations to require the present negotiation of new delineation of functions agreements between all community college districts and local boards of education.

I can state authoritatively that this was not meant to be a recommendation of the Commission. In drafting the Final Report, it was intended that these recommendations (5 through 9) would only go into effect after implementation by the Legislature of Recommendations 1 through 4 on page 9.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
1238 S STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

March 31, 1981

Senator Peter Behr
Chairman
Adult Education Policy Commission
Inverness, CA 94937

Dear Senator Behr:

First, let me congratulate you for your willingness to serve as chairman of the Adult Education Policy Commission. You did a superb job guiding our deliberations on this extremely important and sensitive issue. The report represents a compromise and reflects a final position which is probably not satisfactory to any particular point of view. Given the complexity of the subject matter and the deeply felt convictions of those who offer the programs, a report which satisfies no one is, perhaps, all that might be expected.

There is, however, one point which is so important as to deserve special attention and to which I must register my concern. It was my understanding the Commission was in agreement that existing adult education programs were to be continued to be offered by the current providers. Not to guarantee that those offering programs currently should continue to do so would be catastrophic. In many areas of the state, delineation of function agreements have existed for years, to the mutual satisfaction of both K-12 adult schools and community colleges. The most visible of these are San Francisco, where the community college offers the entire program, and Los Angeles, where the program is offered by the Los Angeles Unified School District. There are many other areas such as San Diego and my own Sweetwater district in which the existing delineation of function agreements have served us all well. To open these agreements to new negotiations would, I am afraid, generate chaos and open warfare. I strongly urge the inclusion of a provision which would presume the continuation of the program by the current provider for a minimum number of years.

There are other points in the report with which I disagree, but disagreement with specific provisions is to be expected given the nature of the compromise proposal. I prefer in this response to emphasize the one area of the report I find most difficult to accept. I wish to have this letter appended to the report.

Thank you once again for the excellent job you did as chairman.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Lassman

Marilyn Lassman
Member

To: Peter Behr, Chairperson
Adult Education Policy Commission

I have reviewed the final report of the Commission and agree, in principle, with the general approach to the problems of delineation of functions and equity of funding reflected in the recommendations.

Marilyn Lawman 3-30-81
Commission Member date

✓ A letter from me summarizing aspects of the final report with which I am in personal disagreement is ~~enclosed~~. SEPARATE COVER

___ I do not feel that my personal response is necessary at this time.

Peter Behr, Chairperson
Adult Education Policy Commission

I have reviewed the Report of the Adult Education Policy Commission to the California Legislature and concur that it substantially reflects the deliberation of the Commission except for Items A and B below which were agreed to by the Commission but were either omitted or not clearly articulated in the Commission Report.

I understand that this letter in which I further express my personal disagreement with certain areas of the report (Item C through G) will be attached to the report and become a part of the Commission Report.

Item A

The Commission agreed to recommend that the Legislature amend the educational code as necessary so that both the K-12 segment and the Community Colleges would be able to offer the full range of courses and grant appropriate certificates or diplomas in the subject areas listed in the California Education Code, Section 41976.

Item B

The Commission agreed that the Community Colleges will continue to offer courses to adult students outside the areas listed in the California Education Code, Section 41976 and that such courses will receive state apportionment as provided in the Community College finance bill.

Item C

On page 5 of the Commission Report the following statement is included, "The existing policy situation has created concern on the part of the Commission that the overall fiscal savings to the taxpayer that restriction on K-12 adult education programs were designed to effect may be ineffective". No evidence was presented to the Commission which would indicate that the Legislature was unaware of the consequences of its actions when it adopted various school and/or Community College finance bills after the passage of Proposition 13. On the contrary, I believe that the Legislature indeed intended to foster a gradual shift of adult education programs from K-12 to the Community Colleges so that adult students could benefit from better counseling, job placement assistance, financial help and opportunities to develop a more comprehensive total educational program than what might be offered in the limited environment of the K-12 schools. By adopting such subtle financial incentives the Legislature indeed took an initial step in implementing what has become goal number 2 in the Commission Report (page 2). i.e. "It is inappropriate and wasteful to make dramatic changes that would have the effect of disrupting, weakening or closing programs of either the K-12 or Community College segments which currently are serving these needs in an effective manner."

Item D

I disagree with the Commission Report statement on page 6, "Although this proposal would resolve the delineation of functions issue, the Commission can find no evidence that it would be a cost effective solution and found some evidence that the proposal would result in increased burdens to the state's taxpayers".

If all adult programs were transferred to the Community Colleges, under current legislation the state would be required to fund the adult ADA at the incremental rate of $1,207 per/ADA. The Commission's recommendation number 1 is to fund all ADA at a $1,300 rate resulting in an even greater burden to the state's taxpayer.

Item E

I must disagree with the recommendation number 1 because it will be very costly to the taxpayer. It would be educationally better and more cost effective to transfer all adult education programs to Community Colleges and offer the opportunity to adult students to receive the increased services which are available at the Community Colleges.

Item F

Recommendation number 2 would introduce another categorical program. I disagree with this approach. I believe that it is far better to allow locally elected officials to allocate resources in a way which best serves their community rather than have the Legislature impose categorical program on every

district. I would recommend that the Legislature adopt goals for adult education and charge the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office to see that the districts make every possible effort to reach those goals.

Item G

Recommendations 5 and 7; Certain districts are operating under delineation of functions agreements which implement the language ratified by the voters at elections held at the time the Community Colleges were separated from the Unified districts. Other agreements have been approved for extended and/or undetermined periods. No useful purpose would be served by forcing every district to reach a <u>new</u> agreement. On the contrary, this might encourage what one witness defined as "a collision course", in describing a relationship between the Unified schools and the Community Colleges in his area.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel B. Grady

Daniel B. Grady, Member
Adult Education Policy Commission

April 2, 1981

Foothill-De Anza
Community College District

12345 El Monte Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
(415) 948-8590

Thomas W. Fryer, Jr., Chancellor

Foothill College
De Anza College

April 2, 1981

Hon. Peter Behr, Chairman
Adult Education Policy Commission
Inverness, California 94937

Dear Peter:

I have today signed the report of the joint legislative commission on adult education, doing so as a gesture of my respect and affection for you and my fellow commissioners rather than as an indication of agreement with the report or even agreement that it accurately reflects the decisions reached by the commission itself.

Previous commissions, as well as ours, have failed to solve the adult education problem because, in my opinion, the problem is insoluble. There are two principal issues at the root of this intractability; these are complicated by two others. First, there is the turf issue. Conscientious educators in both sectors feel that adult education is "theirs", and ought to be theirs alone. Second, and related to the first, there are the feelings of the individual adult education providers. Long-standing personal enmities are part of this problem. Experience shows that reason is a fragile vessel when beat upon the rocks of territoriality and human feelings. These two fundamental issues have been complicated by legislatively induced oscillations in fiscal incentive for providing adult education between the two principal segments. Finally, our commission heard testimony that with respect to adult education, the Los Angeles Unified School District and the Los Angeles Community College District are on a "collision course." California history demonstrates that problems in Los Angeles provoke legislatively mandated solutions all over the state, everywhere, in fact, it seems, but in Los Angeles.

A textbook solution to the problem of overlapping jurisdictions is to assign the adult education function either to the community colleges or to the secondary schools, granting statewide exclusive right to provide adult education services to one sector or the other. As a matter of practical politics this seems impossible, and as a matter of educational fact, both sectors are at present providing fine programs in different areas of the state. I believe profoundly in the efficacy of local determination; so I do not propose a single, final solution for all of California.

Board of Trustees: Dr. Gerald Besson Alfred P. Chasuk Franklin P. Johnson Dr. Robert Smithwick Mary Wallace Wheat

On the other hand, at the present time, adult education in the public schools finds itself in a position roughly analagous to that of the Confederacy following the Battle of Gettysburg. Available funds are clearly inadequate to provide proper support for the programs, and there is an unrealistic cap on program growth during a time of intensifying need.

The solution our report proposes is equivalent to the intervention in the Civil War of France and other European countries on the side of the Confederacy. The war will be infused with a fresh supply of money and munitions; hostilities will be renewed and prolonged. New battles will be fought all over the State of California. Truces which have been made will be broken, and peace treaties which have been signed will be torn up.

Furthermore, in a year of fiscal austerity for the State of California, our commission proposes a 35 to 40% increase in funds for secondary sector adult programs, and it tears apart the educational programs of community colleges in such a way that one major function of our institutions is separated from other major educational functions. Thus we take one more step down the road which, in my opinion, has been so debilitating to this State's elementary and secondary schools, viz., the proliferation of categorical programs.

The commission proposes to address a problem in one sector, i.e., underfunding adult education in secondary schools, by creating a problem in another sector, i.e., wrenching apart the community college educational program.

Further, it proposes to solve disputes between locally elected governing boards by submitting such disputes to a non-elected arbitrator who makes a final and binding decision. I do not agree with this procedure and feel that, when disputes cannot be resolved through a process of deliberation, mediation, and factfinding between locally elected boards, the electorate itself should make the final decision.

In summary, my specific views are first, that the so-called mandated or authorized areas enumerated in Education Code Section 41976 should be opened by statute equally to both segments (the report is not clear on this point); second, that agreements should be reached between local boards of education and community college boards of trustees with respect to which jurisdiction will provide which program(s); third, that irreconcilable disputes between the parties, after a period of mediation and factfinding, should be submitted to the voters for final determination; and fourth, that fund equity be approached by funding all new adult ADA beyond 1980-81 as base year at the community college incremental rate, whether the adult ADA is generated in the community college or adult education segments -- a much less costly approach to equity than that proposed by our commission.

Peter, notwithstanding our differences on the outcome of our efforts, it has been a delight to work with you.

Sincerely,

Tom

Thomas W. Fryer, Jr.

TWF:vjm

Enclosure